

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT

ENDC/PV.308
27 June 1967

ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 27 June 1967, at 10.30 a.m.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

NOV 8 1967

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

Chairman:

Mr. K. CHRISTOV (Bulgaria)

GE.67-11641

67-18025

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A. F. AZEREDO da SILVEIRA

Mr. C. A. de SOUZA e SILVA

Mr. S. de QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. CHRISTOV

Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV

Mr. T. DAMIANOV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG

U KYAW MIN

Canada:

Mr. E. L. M. BURNS

Mr. S. F. RAE

Mr. C. J. MARSHALL

Mr. J. R. MORDEN

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. P. WINKLER

Mr. V. VAJNAR

Mr. A. ZELLEKE

Ethiopia:

Mr. B. ASSFAW

India:

Mr. V. C. TRIVEDI

Mr. N. KRISHNAN

Mr. K. P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. G. P. TOZZOLI

Mr. E. FRANCO

Mr. F. SORO

Mexico:

Mr. J. CASTANEDA

Miss E. AGUIRRE

Mr. F. CORREA

Nigeria:

Alhaji SULE KOLO

Mr. B. O. TONWE

Poland:

Mr. J. GOLDELAT

Mr. E. STANIEWSKI

Romania:

Mr. N. ECOBESCO
Mr. O. IONESCO
Mr. C. GEORGESCO
Mr. A. COROLIANU

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL
Mr. A. EDELSTAM
Mr. R. BOMAN
Mr. U. ERICSSON

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A. A. ROSHCHIN
Mr. V. P. SUSLOV
Mr. I. M. PALENYKH

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. KHALLAF
Mr. A. OSMAN
Mr. A. A. SALAM
Mr. M. SHAKER

United Kingdom:

Mr. I. F. PORTER
Mr. R. I. T. CROMARTIE
Mr. R. J. O'NEILL

United States of America:

Mr. W. C. FOSTER
Mr. G. BUNN
Mr. C. G. BREAM
Mr. C. GLEYSTEN

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

1. The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): I declare open the three hundred and eighth plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.
2. Mr. TRIVEDI (India): I thought I might make a brief statement this morning to refer to two points on which there is a certain amount of misunderstanding. These points have been expressed repeatedly, particularly by the non-aligned delegations, in Geneva and in New York, but the misunderstandings still seem to persist.
3. The first misunderstanding is in regard to the so-called demand of the non-aligned countries for a compensation, for a quid pro quo, in return for something. This is completely wrong. Even as an expression in layman's language it is a completely wrong exposition of the non-aligned stand. When the non-aligned delegations say that there should be a faithful observance of the principle of United Nations General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX) (ENDC/161), that there should be a balance of obligations and responsibilities of nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon Powers embodied in the treaty, they do not mean it as a compensation, as something that has to be given to fob off certain people, as a quid pro quo. What the non-aligned delegations say is that the only way to solve the problem of proliferation is to have a balanced treaty, a treaty which embodies this balance and this mutuality. It has nothing to do with compensation. Nobody wants compensation or a quid pro quo.
4. In fact, this is not something which has been brought out only by resolution 2028 (XX). This has been the philosophy of non-proliferation throughout. The United States delegation said so, the Soviet delegation said so in the early days. In fact, in the discussions of the Sub-Committee on Disarmament in the fifties the French and the British delegations said it in very stark terms. We are all talking about the absence of France in our Committee, but Mr. Jules Moch said very clearly that you cannot possibly have prevention of further proliferation unless you stop production of fissile material for weapon purposes for all countries. So did the United Kingdom representative, Mr. Anthony Nutting on 28 March 1956 in the Sub-Committee on Disarmament (DC/SC.1/PV.74, pp.47, 48). I quoted his statement in the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1966 (A/C.1/PV.1445, p.67). I am not trying to say that this is what they say at present: they are not saying it now. What I am trying to say is that this is the philosophy of non-proliferation, this is the real way of dealing with the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It has nothing to do with compensation; it has nothing to do with a quid pro quo. Nobody wants any compensation.

(Mr. Trivedi, India)

5. The second misunderstanding which still persists is in regard to the statement being made that we must not ask for measures of disarmament in a treaty on non-proliferation. Well, nobody does ask for them -- except, perhaps, the People's Republic of China, which is not a member of this body. But even China, I think, does not ask for them in a treaty of non-proliferation. However, that is beside the point.

6. Disarmament means to reduce arms, to remove arms, to disarm. Measures of disarmament are something different from measures of non-armament that we are talking about in connexion with a treaty of non-proliferation. And when the delegation of India says -- as all delegations have said in the past at some time or other, even though some of them may not say it now -- that an equitable treaty should embody a mutual and balanced obligation for all countries to cease production of nuclear weapons, that is not disarmament. It is not reduction of arms. In fact, General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX) put forward five separate principles. It did not combine them, and its principle (b) and principle (c) are two separate principles. They act and react on each other, but they are separate principles in recognition of the fact that these are two separate issues.

7. Principle (b) says that "The treaty should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers". When you are considering a treaty on non-armament, all countries must assume the same responsibilities -- the balanced responsibilities, the mutual responsibilities -- for non-armament.

8. But there is a separate principle that "The treaty should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament and, more particularly, nuclear disarmament". It is in that context that we talk about measures of disarmament -- whether there should be just a pious preambular platitude or some specific obligations, some specific mention. However, I do not want to go into the details of these things; I have already done so in my statement of 8 June (ENDC/PV.303). But I think that in this Committee we should, consciously or unconsciously, avoid these misunderstandings.

(Mr. Trivedi, India)

9. There is a third point I want to emphasize. It is related to the statements -- the very lofty statements -- being made about the tremendous handicap of a nuclear weapons programme and what a calamity it would be for a nation. We wholeheartedly and entirely agree, but that is not the point. When the non-aligned delegations say that we should have a good treaty, a treaty which really solves the problem of proliferation, it has nothing to do with a nuclear weapons development programme. I do not know why that is being brought in. I hope the insidious and mischievous allegation is not there that because you do not want a discriminatory treaty, a wrong treaty, a treaty which would not solve the problem of proliferation then obviously you are asking for nuclear weapons. That is not logical.

10. I am not saying anything in detail as far as our delegation or our country is concerned. We have shown our attitude by word and by deed for years. We had the capacity to manufacture nuclear weapons long before China had, and we refrained from doing so. China has now exploded a thermonuclear device, and we still continue to maintain the same policy. It has nothing to do with a nuclear weapons development programme, but we want a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which will solve the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons.

11. Finally, I should like to make a humble request to our colleagues. We have different approaches, different views, different ideas on a non-proliferation treaty. We should like the treaty to be drafted in a certain way; another delegation would like it drafted differently. But I beseech our colleagues, please not to say that because another delegation does not accept fully and in toto their ideas on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons it is against the treaty. It does not befit a responsible member of this Committee to say that because its discriminatory notions are not acceptable to a certain country that country is against the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. That is completely wrong, and certainly it is not the position to adopt in a negotiating committee.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 308th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador K. Christov, representative of Bulgaria.

"A statement was made by the representative of India.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 29 June 1967, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 10.50 a.m.

